

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 MMD FAMILY FOUNDATION, et al.,
8 Plaintiffs,
9
10 v.
11 JAMES LEECH, et al.,
12 Defendants.

13 Case No. 16-cv-04967-JCS

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
RE SUA SPONTE REMAND**

22 **I. INTRODUCTION**

23 Defendants James and Janeen Leach, pro se, removed this unlawful detainer action from
24 state court on the basis of federal question jurisdiction. The undersigned recommends that this
25 case be REMANDED sua sponte to the Superior Court of California for the County of Alameda.
26 Because the parties have not consented to the jurisdiction of a United States magistrate judge, this
27 case will be reassigned to a United States district judge for further proceedings, including action
28 on these recommendations. Any party may file objections to these recommendations within
fourteen days of being served with a copy of this Report.

29 **II. ANALYSIS**

30 Federal courts have limited subject matter jurisdiction, and may only hear cases falling
31 within their jurisdiction. A defendant may remove a civil action filed in state court if the action
32 could have been filed originally in federal court. 28 U.S.C. § 1441. The removal statutes are
33 construed restrictively so as to limit removal jurisdiction. *Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp. v. Sheets*,
34 313 U.S. 100, 108–09 (1941). The Ninth Circuit recognizes a “strong presumption against
35 removal.” *Gaus v. Miles, Inc.*, 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992) (internal quotations omitted).
36 Any doubts as to removability should be resolved in favor of remand. *Matheson v. Progressive*

1 *Specialty Ins. Co.*, 319 F.3d 1089, 1090 (9th Cir. 2003). The defendant bears the burden of
2 showing that removal is proper. *Valdez v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 372 F.3d 1115, 1117 (9th Cir. 2004).

3 Defendant's Notice of Removal invokes federal question jurisdiction. *See* Notice of
4 Removal at p. 9. Federal question jurisdiction under § 1331 encompasses civil actions that arise
5 under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1331. "A case
6 'arises under' federal law either where federal law creates the cause of action or 'where the
7 vindication of a right under state law necessarily turns on some construction of federal law.'" *Republican Party of Guam v. Gutierrez*, 277 F.3d 1086, 1088 (9th Cir. 2002) (citations omitted).
8 "The presence or absence of federal-question jurisdiction is governed by the 'well-pleaded
9 complaint rule,' which provides that federal jurisdiction exists only when a federal question is
10 presented on the face of the plaintiff's properly pleaded complaint." *Wayne v. DHL Worldwide
11 Express*, 294 F.3d 1179, 1183 (9th Cir. 2002) (quoting *Caterpillar, Inc. v. Williams*, 482 U.S. 386,
12 392 (1987)). A federal question must arise from the complaint—it is "settled law that a case may
13 not be removed to federal court on the basis of a federal defense." *Caterpillar*, 482 U.S. at 393.
14

15 Here, the Complaint alleges only violations of California state law. The federal statutory
16 and constitutional provisions that Defendants invoke in the Notice of Removal are federal
17 defenses, which do not provide a basis for removal. *See Caterpillar*, 482 U.S. at 393. The
18 undersigned therefore finds no basis for federal jurisdiction, and recommends that the case be
19 remanded.¹
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ¹ The Court notes that Defendants expressly state in the Notice of Removal that federal
27 jurisdiction is not based on diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Notice of Removal at 9.
28 In any event, Defendants could not properly remove the action to federal court from California
state court on the basis of diversity because it is apparent from the Notice of Removal that
Defendant James Leach is a local defendant. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b)(2).

1 **III. CONCLUSION**

2 For the reasons stated above, the undersigned recommends that this action be
3 REMANDED to the California Superior Court for Alameda County. **The Court vacates the**
4 **December 2, 2016 Case Management Conference.**

5
6 Dated: October 11, 2016

7
8 

9 JOSEPH C. SPERO
10 Chief Magistrate Judge

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28